Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: SEPTEMBER 8 - 10, 1993

GEORGIA STATE REPORT

July 5, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A - State of Georgia Exhibits

GEORGIA STATE REPORT
Site Visit September 8 - 10, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Public Assistance Reporting Information System (PARIS)/Public Assistance Reporting Information System - On-Line (PARISOL)

Start Date: 1975 (PARIS)
1988 (PARISOL)

Completion Date: 1984 (PARIS)
1990 (PARISOL)

Contractor: Consultec (PARIS)
In-house development (PARISOL)

Transfer From: Not applicable

Cost:

	PARIS, Clearing-house, PARISOL*	PARISOL only
Actual:	$14,970,000	$2,571,602
Projected:	Not available	$9,591,571
FSP Share:	Not available	$1,146,094
FSP %:	Not available	44.6%

Number of Users: 2,820

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: 3090/600E
Workstations: IBM 3270/PCs
Telecommunications Network: Statewide backbone with T1 and 56 KB circuits under SNA/SDLC

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid

* Further breakdown of development cost data was not available

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

Public assistance (PA) programs in Georgia are State-administered. The State-level department responsible for this function is the Georgia Department of Human Resources (DHR), which consists of the following organizational units:

- Budget Services
- Office of Aging
- Public Affairs
- Administrative Services
- Office of Regulatory Services
- Division of Family and Children Services
- Division of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse
- Division of Public Health
- Division of Rehabilitation Services
- Division of Youth Services

Responsibility for the operations of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and other public assistance programs rests with the Division of Family and Children Services (DFCS); this unit is divided into the following organizational subunits:

- Office of Community Services
- Office of Child Support Recovery
- Administrative Support Section
- Social Services Section
- Quality Assurance
- Field Management
- Economic Support Services
- Human Resources Management

The Field Management and Economic Support Services (ESS) sections have responsibilities related to administering PA programs. The Field Management section oversees county operations. ESS, which provides State-level administration and support for PA programs, consists of the following units:

- AFDC/FS Policy
- AFDC/FS Program Management
- Employability
- Management Information Systems
- Medicaid
- Claims
- Operations Support
- Special Projects

The PARIS/PARISOL computer system supports public assistance programs throughout the State. The system is operated by State data center staff in the Department of Administrative Services

(DOAS) and is supported by analysts in the Management Information Systems Unit of the ESS Section of the Division of Family and Children Services.

State public assistance staff described Georgia as a combination of rural and urban environments. The State's food stamp recipient population is divided between towns with populations over 50,000 persons and rural communities. In 1990, the total population of the State of Georgia was 6,508,419. Food stamp recipients comprised 7.7 percent of the total population.

Georgia's unemployment rate has been relatively stable in recent years. In 1985, the unemployment rate was 6.5 percent. Unemployment decreased in 1986 and 1987. In 1988, it increased by 0.3 percent from the previous year to 5.8 percent. Unemployment decreased each year between 1989 and 1991 to reach a 1991 rate of 5.0 percent.

The October 1992 report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Georgia's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 5.0 percent and 9.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Georgia reduced the 1992 State budget by $540 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Georgia increased by 0.35 percent. This change differed in direction from the national average decrease of 0.60 percent in State government employment.
- Georgia's revenue increased by $236.1 million for FY 1993. Revenues were increased through a combination of sales tax and fees.
- The regional outlook indicated that economic growth is slow in the Southeast. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 7.6 percent was slightly lower than the national average of 7.8 percent. The per capita regional personal income increase of 3.0 percent was greater than the national average of 2.4 percent; however, the poorer states (Mississippi and Louisiana) experienced the greatest growth.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The Food Stamp Program is administered through a network of 189 local direct service offices within 159 counties. While the FSP is State-administered in Georgia, counties are responsible for some local operations including benefit issuance. FSP issuance workers report to county directors, who manage all eligibility and social service functions within the county. County directors report to the DFCS Field Management section. Counties are reimbursed for 50 percent of the administrative costs associated with issuance functions.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Changes in participation levels for the FSP and other public assistance programs for the last five full years are provided in Table 2.1.[1] Based on the number of Food Stamp Program households, participation increased by 63.4 percent from 1988 through 1992. The number of individuals participating in the FSP increased by 57.8 percent during the same period. For the five year period, AFDC participation (cases) increased by approximately 51.9 percent, and the number of individuals receiving Medicaid assistance increased by 54.2 percent.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	131,665	112,403	99,068	91,307	86,663
Individuals	375,806	324,741	261,638	261,638	247,758
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA					
Cases	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Individuals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP					
Households	276,524	226,724	189,997	172,083	169,274
Individuals	718,960	597,062	501,728	456,461	455,493
Medicaid	402,501	336,752	292,421	275,067	261,106

Participation data from the first eight months of 1993 indicates that a reversal in participation trends may be occurring. Average monthly FSP participation during the period dropped to 215,842 households. This figure represents a decrease of 21.9 percent from the average monthly participation in 1992. A 28.1 percent decrease (to 94,625 cases) in AFDC caseload occurred during the same time period.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 7.3:1 in 1988 to 13.4:1 in 1992.

Georgia's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.[2]

[1] Participation figures provided by State staff based on average monthly participation during the Fiscal Year.

[2] The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$181.57	$172.66	$158.60	$138.81	$133.01

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Georgia's FSP administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.[3] The data indicates that total administrative costs increased each year from 1988 to 1991 and decreased in 1992. It also shows an increase in average cost per household in 1989, no change in 1990, and decreases in 1991 and 1992.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$46,334,675	$46,791,767	$45,803,881	$41,282,470	$37,473,038
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$13.42	$15.99	$18.99	$18.99	$18.16

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Areas of Food Stamp Program performance that could potentially be affected by the automated systems that support the Program include:

- Staffing
- Responsiveness to Regulatory Change
- Combined Official Payment Error Rates
- Claims Collection
- Certification/Reviews

[3] The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

2.4.1 Staffing

State officials indicated that current staffing includes: 1,538 eligibility workers (EW), 323 eligibility worker supervisors, and 159 county directors. There have not been any sizeable staff increases since 1981. Food stamp issuance workers are county employees, and the size of this work force is not known at the State level. State staff indicated, however, that the number of personnel dedicated to the issuance function has decreased since the system became operational. State staff indicated that important reasons for this decrease include the increase in direct mail issuance and the use of outside contractors.

In Georgia, there is some specialization of eligibility staff by program area. In some counties, workers perform eligibility activities for both the AFDC and Food Stamp

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data including: the dollar value of claims established, the dollar value of claims collected, and the percentage of claims established that were collected. The overall annual dollar value of claims collected increased each year, while the dollar value of claims established showed an overall decrease during the five-year period. The value of claims established in 1992 represented a 56 percent decrease from the peak value in 1989. The dollar amount of claims established decreased gradually from 1989 to 1991 and decreased sharply in 1992.

Since the yearly variation in claim collection amounts was much smaller than the variation in claims established, Georgia's claims collected as a percentage of claims established was inversely related to the value of claims established in a given year. The lowest percentage was in 1989, when claims established were at their peak. The percentage increased each year after that. In 1992, the percent of claims established that were collected was over 60 percent; this primarily reflected the large decline in claims established. In addition, there was an increase in claims collected. The percentage of claims that can be collected is influenced by several factors including: the total number of claims established, whether the individual is still receiving benefits, and the amount of available resources for collection activities.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$10,688,961	$20,732,957	$23,494,135	$24,042,254	$18,427,679
Total Claims Collected	$6,462,474	$5,777,726	$5,401,900	$4,473,540	$4,197,211
As a % of Total Claims Established	60.5%	27.7%	22.3%	18.6%	22.8%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The original PARIS system received Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in 1983. PARISOL enhancements have not yet been certified by DHHS. State staff expressed uncertainty about whether the modifications implemented to the original PARIS system as a result of the PARISOL project were significant enough to warrant re-certification.

State staff did not have information about whether an FNS Post-Implementation Review had been conducted for PARIS or PARISOL.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of PARIS/PARISOL functionality, complexity, and level of integration.

3.1 System Functionality

Major features of PARIS/PARISOL functionality are described in this section. Areas addressed include:

- ***Registration.*** When a food stamp applicant enters a direct service office, the applicant is given a two page application form to complete. In larger offices, this form is then reviewed by a "screener," who determines if the applicant is eligible for expedited services. In smaller counties, the eligibility worker may conduct the screening function. In most cases, basic application data is entered into the system by a clerical employee who is responsible for reviewing potential matches in the participation file and for indicating whether the record is to be included in the new case file.

  The participation files searched at time of registration include both AFDC and FSP current and previously active clients. The search is conducted for each household member, and the entire list of household members is saved in the system as part of the application process. Searches are performed using the applicant's name, Social Security Number (SSN), date of birth, sex, and if available, the current Client Identification Number (CIN).

  Registration of the case begins the 30-day standard of promptness time period. The registration process involves the assignment of a Client Identification Number to each case member if the individual does not already have a CIN. The CIN is not tied to a particular case and remains with the client even though case participation may change over time.

  An interview with an eligibility worker is scheduled at the time of registration. Scheduling may be performed by the system, or the function can be handled manually depending on local office procedures.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Since November 1992, the use of the PARISOL interactive interview capability has been required by the State of Georgia. The vast majority of cases are now handled through interactive interviews; however, some counties still do not use an interactive interview process. In these offices, the applicant completes the *Eligibility Document Interview Guide*, which then is

reviewed by the eligibility worker during the interview. Data are entered into the system for official eligibility determination purposes after the interview.

The system contains several features to assist the worker in conducting eligibility determination interviews. PARIS/PARISOL capabilities include immediate on-line data edits for code values and logic conditions. The system can present required screens in order, or the worker may view all screens and by-pass the ones which are irrelevant to a particular case. On-line "calculator" screens are also available. The system searches both the Department of Labor (DOL) and claims data for potential matches as part of its eligibility determination process.

The system automatically determines the client's eligibility if all necessary data are present. The system provides status fields to determine if all necessary verifications have been received. A batch outstanding verification report is available for all pending cases and on-line screen displays prompt workers to verify certain information.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** While the system automatically determines eligibility for the programs to which the applicant has applied, it does not determine the specific individuals within the household who comprise the relevant unit for each assistance program or the benefit level. Both of these determinations are made by the eligibility worker. Supervisory authorization of benefit calculation results are required for all new and re-applying cases.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** Georgia issues benefits through the use of two methods: direct mail issuance and authorization to participate (ATP) documents. Direct mail accounts for approximately 68 percent of all issuances, and ATPs are used for the remaining 32 percent of issuances.

  ATPs may be issued either at local offices or from the centralized State facility. ATPs for expedited service and coupon replacements may be issued directly from the local offices. Manual issuance of ATPs at the local offices enables the State to provide expedited coupons on the day of application. The PARIS/PARISOL system can identify expired or duplicate ATPs. Altered, stolen, counterfeit and out-of-state ATPs are reconciled by a private vendor.

  Georgia delegates responsibility for coupon issuance to individual counties. Most counties have contracted with private vendors for the actual mail issuance of coupons. although a few counties perform the function in-house. Two major vendors are involved in mail issuance in the State. PARIS/PARISOL produces lists of recipients and benefit amounts. These lists are then forwarded to the private vendors' sites, where coupons are stuffed and mailed.

  Georgia has initiated planning for an electronic benefit transfer (EBT) system. A Planning Advanced Planning Document (PAPD) is currently being evaluated. The

PAPD proposes conducting an on-line EBT demonstration pilot project in the near future. Federal approval has not yet been obtained for this project.

- ***Notices.*** The PARIS/PARISOL system can generate both automatic and worker-initiated notices to recipient households. The capability for the EW to add narrative comments into system-generated notices does not exist in PARIS/PARISOL. The types of notices that can be generated include: key events related to household participation and household eligibility, warning that a monthly report was not received, denial because of failure to keep appointments, eligibility determination results, benefit reductions and increases, application approval, denial based on eligibility determination, closure based on recertification information, and missing verifications.

  Notices are printed at a central State location and mailed directly from the central location. Two copies of each notice are produced; one copy is mailed to the recipient, and the other is maintained for the case record. FSP and AFDC notices are not combined, and the State does not plan to combine these notices until a new eligibility system is developed.

- ***Claims System.*** The claims system in Georgia is integrated within PARIS/PARISOL. The system maintains a record of both outstanding and collected claims.

  Claims are established by the EW, who completes paper data entry forms. Information is entered into the PARIS system. The worker also enters the cause of the overpayment or underpayment and whether fraud is suspected. The worker has the ability to override the system's calculation of the corrected benefit allotment amounts. The establishment of a claim record on the system must be approved by a supervisor.

  The claims system tracks the claim status, automatically generates a notice to the client regarding overpayment or underpayment, and shows the complete collection record on-line. It also calculates the appropriate monthly recoupment amount to be subtracted from the recipient's benefit allotment. State and Federal tax intercepts are used to recover funds on collection cases.

- ***Computer Matching.*** Computer matching in Georgia is performed in both on-line and batch modes. Participation matching is conducted at eligibility determination and recertification points as well as in monthly and quarterly batch cycles. Georgia currently shares participant data with three adjoining states through the intermittent exchange of tapes. On-line matching is performed against the DOL unemployment and wage data base, Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), and the State Data Exchange (SDX). Matching against Child Support Enforcement (CSE), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), and Vital Record searches data also can be performed. Batch matching is performed against Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Beneficiary Earnings Exchanges System (BEERS) and quarterly wage data.

Georgia currently has a waiver in effect for the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) quarterly wage matches.

"Hits" are defined as Social Security Number matches, and Georgia does not use selective criteria or thresholds to narrow the hit parameters. Discrepancies are reported to the worker in the form of paper printouts and are not saved on the system.

The on-line system is not utilized to track discrepancies or to perform alert functions related to resolving reported discrepancies. This feature was a part of the original system, but it was discontinued due to the heavy volume of discrepancy related alerts. Tracking of discrepancies is performed manually by the eligibility worker and supervisory staff.

State staff indicated that both the on-line and batch matching processes have the tendency to slow down the normal workflow of eligibility workers.

- ***Alerts.*** The PARIS/PARISOL system generates on-line alerts to workers to inform workers about past due and due activities. The information is provided through the Eligibility and Supervisor Activity Screens in the system.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** The automated system determines which cases are subject to monthly reporting, produces the monthly report forms for mailing, directs the returned form to the assigned eligibility worker, and automatically closes the case if the monthly reporting form is not received. The system provides screens that enable workers to update the status of the monthly reporting forms.

  Clerical workers in the local offices are responsible for entering data into the system regarding the receipt of monthly reporting forms and changes in case data provided on completed forms. When forms are incomplete, workers are required to manually prepare a notice to be mailed to the recipient.

- ***Report Generation.*** Reporting capabilities of the PARIS/PARISOL system include the generation of several types of paper reports. The system provides reports to eligibility workers on a daily basis that indicate outstanding work needing attention and pending cases. The system automatically produces several reports required by FNS, including the FNS-250, FNS-46, FNS-259, and FNS-388 reports. The PARIS/PARISOL system also provides a Monthly Reconciliation Report and reports on un-transacted and outstanding ATPs.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** Georgia maintains an electronic mail system for communicating messages and memoranda at the county director and supervisory levels only.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

The automated system currently supports the AFDC, Food Stamp and Medicaid Programs. Supplemental Security Income (SSI) related Medicaid is not supported by the system, and adult category cases are served in a limited manner. Child Support Enforcement, Refugee Assistance, and other State Programs are not supported by PARIS/PARISOL, but the State plans to include these as integrated program areas or interfaced functions in its new system development effort.

PARIS/PARISOL is primarily a batch oriented system that is heavily dependent upon paper outputs. The system consists of eight regional nodes connected to a central mainframe. Decentralized databases at the nodes contain only the portion of the PARIS/PARISOL database for the particular geographical area. Case files, for on-line processing, are established at the nodes and all update transactions are stored there until data are sent to the central mainframe in batch mode. Node files also are updated to reflect changes in the central database (e.g., issuance, claims) on a daily basis through batch processing.

A statewide clearinghouse capability enables field workers to access other State data sources by establishing and maintaining interfaces with the Georgia DOL, SDX, BENDEX, Child Support Enforcement, Vital Records, Department of Medical Assistance, Fiscal Accounting Control System, and Georgia Department of Revenue.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Georgia staff indicated that the workstation to caseworker ratio is one to one across the State.

State staff indicated that approximately 2,820 terminals are installed in Georgia. Terminals are provided to other users, including State office policy and technical staff and field personnel such as county directors.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Georgia has initiated planning for two system development efforts. The State has submitted, for Federal review and approval, both a PAPD and a RFP for a new eligibility system. State staff expected a response to the PAPD, which was submitted in April 1993, by October 1, 1993. Georgia staff indicated that systems currently in use in the states of Wisconsin, Indiana, Tennessee, and Maryland have impressed them and might be considered as transfer candidates for the Georgia development effort.

The State also has initiated planning for an EBT project. Georgia has not yet received Federal approval for its planned EBT system.

Current system concerns include periodic response time problems, system availability shortfalls, and field complaints regarding the amount of staff time taken up by the

interactive interview approach of PARIS/PARISOL. All major enhancements and upgrades to the existing PARIS/PARISOL system, however, have been suspended in anticipation of approval of the new eligibility system development project.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

At the time of the State visit, the new eligibility system was in the planning stages and very little information was available about it. Therefore, this section focuses on the system development and implementation activities for the PARISOL project. The PARIS system is considered to be the previous system.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

PARIS was implemented over ten years ago as a batch oriented eligibility determination and benefit calculation system. Several modifications had been made to PARIS prior to the PARISOL project. These included changes to comply with IEVS requirements and the establishment of a "clearinghouse" or Master Client Index which accessed data supplied by several State agencies.

Problems noted with PARIS included:

- Batch processing required an overnight turnaround before eligibility determination results were known to the worker.
- Management reports often showed results based on out-of-date data due to the batch processing schedule.
- Field workers still relied upon case records, even though the case records may not have contained all information known to the system.
- The case processing sub-system consisted of several very large, non-modular, programs that were difficult to modify and test.
- The use of paper turnaround documents resulted in timeliness delays in client tracking and input verification.

The major problems with the PARIS system were related to its batch orientation and reliance upon the use of paper turnaround documents. In addition, the technical design of the system made maintenance and modification difficult and time consuming.

4.2 Justification for the New System

The stated objectives of the PARISOL project included: reduced error rates, more efficient and effective delivery of services to clients, reduced paper flow, and timely production

of management reports. The new system also was supposed to provide computer assisted interviewing and eligibility determination with rapid system response.

Additional justification was offered in that the new system would utilize much of the computer equipment installed for the existing clearinghouse system, thereby reducing overall system costs.

Internal estimates, which were used to obtain Federal approval of the project, indicated a reduction of 20 percent in the existing error rate resulting in an annual savings of $2,273,220 for the Food Stamp Program and $1,012,082 for AFDC.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

In April 1988, Georgia submitted an Advanced Planning Document (APD) for the development of on-line oriented enhancements to the PARIS system. The new system was named the Public Assistance Reporting Information System - On-Line, or PARISOL. PARISOL was an attempt to move PARIS from a batch to an on-line orientation and to provide additional features to the field staff. The APD was modified to include additional hardware shortly after its original submission, and enhancement work began in the summer of 1988 to modify existing PARIS software.

PARISOL was originally designed to include three distinct phases. These were:

- Intake
- Recertification/redetermination
- Historical changes

Each phase was designed to include the normal system development life cycle approach of general design, detail design, programming, testing, and installation. Development activities were performed by in-house data processing staff from the Department of Administrative Services with assistance provided by contract employees. The original plan was modified from a three-phase effort to a two-phase effort. The development effort was ended, however, after the intake phase had been completed. PARISOL was implemented in 1990.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Case data conversion was not required for the PARISOL project, so the conversion effort consisted of worker training and local office system implementation. A training staff of 25 individuals representing management information systems (MIS), policy, and field operations areas was formed to conduct PARISOL training. Training was designed to include a three day hands-on, on-site session. The functions addressed the first day included: introduction to the system, coding and verifications, problem resolution activities, and screen demonstrations. The following two days' activities consisted of practice sections. Although training for field and administrative workers and supervisory staff was limited to three days of on-site training, slippages in the project schedule and

subsequent delays in the implementation of the system in various local offices necessitated repeating training before implementing the system in the field.

The complete training packet and other materials were developed and tested in each pilot site. A sequential approach was to be used to develop appropriate training approaches for each phase of the PARISOL project. This approach was modified to reflect the elimination of the second and third project phases. State staff indicated that the implementation approach used during the PARISOL project consisted of several counties being piloted in sequence. During this phased implementation, problems that required system corrections were discovered with each implementation.

4.5 Project Management

Following an FNS recommendation, the State hired its original project manager from outside the Department of Human Resources. This individual directed the project for its first six months and reported to the Division of Computer Services within the Georgia Department of Administrative Services.

After this individual left, the head of the Division of Family and Children Services' Management Information Systems Unit assumed the role of project manager and remained in that position for the remainder of the project. Organizational responsibility for the conduct of the project was assumed by the MIS Unit within the DFCS ESS.

The project team consisted of: the project manager, who was dedicated to the project full-time; an employee from DOAS who served as the project supervisor; and program, technical, and financial personnel. The team contained one representative each from the FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid program areas; one financial person; and six MIS representatives. Staff assigned to the project team from the Division of Family and Children Services were primarily business analysts whose duties included examining program rules and policy in terms of system impact. Technical staff from the DOAS Division of Computer Services and the New Development Group were also assigned to the PARISOL project.

A review and advisory committee also was established. This committee consisted of eligibility and regional field staff and included data entry, caseworker, and supervisory staff.

4.6 FSP Participation

A user's group, which included FSP management and field workers, was utilized during the conduct of the development and implementation phases of the PARISOL project, but user input during the planning stage was practically non-existent. The project was viewed by many program staff as being a limited enhancement to the base PARIS system, and as a result, user participation in the initial planning stages was extremely limited.

Both FSP management and eligibility workers were active in establishing requirements and providing recommendations during the development and implementation phases. FSP personnel participated in monthly project meetings during the development phase and biweekly meetings during the implementation phase.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS staff were deeply involved in the PARISOL project. Technical staff participation included both DFCS System Development section representatives and staff from the DOAS Division of Computer Services. The areas of involvement included: establishing requirements, making recommendations, and reviewing and approving project plans. MIS involvement occurred during all phases of the PARISOL project. State staff indicated that the PARISOL project was primarily technically driven, and there was a strong reliance on technical staff from the Division of Computer Services to provide guidance and determine suitable project parameters.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The PARISOL project suffered from a number of slippages and technical shortfalls during its limited lifetime. The development effort was impacted by delayed schedules, increased costs, deleted functionality, and a number of necessary re-writes of developed code. State staff expressed the opinion that project resource requirements were not estimated well by the technical staff of the Department of Administrative Services, which had a time and materials type contract with the DFCS. Georgia staff indicated that staffing problems had a major impact on the schedule slippages experienced in the planning, functional requirements, design, and development stages of the project. Underestimation of time and cost also were cited as factors in these phases, as well as during the implementation phase. Changes in basic requirements also played a role in schedule slippages. These slippages impacted the training and implementation schedule for the intake component.

The major cause of the problems experienced during the PARISOL project, as expressed by State staff, was the inability of the Department of Administrative Services' technical staff to "make the system work." The extent of the technical changes necessary to transform PARIS from a batch to an on-line mode was underestimated by the technical staff. Program management staff indicated that more specifically, major problem areas included design flaws, code "bugs," and inadequate hardware capacity.

Georgia experienced changes in the total scope of the PARISOL system during the course of the project. The major change was in the reduction of program-related functions caused by flaws in the basic design. State staff indicated that the procedures used to make design changes did not adequately consider the needs of program managers. During this period, there were not periodic reviews by systems, program, and user groups to determine the validity of system design changes.

During the initial pilot of the intake module, many system inadequacies were discovered. These included some extensive system "bugs." At this time, program staff realized that

the system did not function in the manner that they expected it would. While the PARISOL APD indicated the intent to develop the intake module for processing at the node level with case information relayed to the central computer in an overnight batch mode (the current process in the PARIS/PARISOL environment), users expected PARISOL to provide a true interactive update of case files.

In 1990, the intake module was the only operational piece of the original PARISOL design, and there were several operational problems. PARISOL began to experience severe response time problems after the pilot site implementation had been completed and the system was implemented in additional sites. This problem led the State to make implementation of the PARISOL features (e.g. interactive interviewing) optional and allow individual counties to make the decision. In addition, field staff were experiencing some

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the PARIS/PARISOL system. The description includes a profile of system components and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting the PARIS/PARISOL system are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090/600E
  MVS/ESA, CICS, Total, RACF
- **Disk:** IBM 3380/3390
  STK 8380
  Hitachi 9390
- **Tape:** Cartridge - IBM 3480
  Hitachi 7480
  Reel - STK 4500
- **Printers:** Impact - STK 3800
  Laser - STK 6100, STK 5000, Xerox 9790
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** Combination of IBM 3270 terminals (EWs) and IBM PCs (supervisors) running in 3270 emulation
- **Telecommunications:** Statewide backbone, eight nodes tied to Atlanta by T1 circuits and connected to local offices by 56 KB tail circuits using SNA/SDLC protocol

A detailed listing is provided as Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment consists of several components. This section describes these components, which include the current operating environment, maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, system downtime, and plans for future hardware and software enhancements.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The Georgia Department of Administrative Services operates the data center and provides technical and application support to the PARIS/PARISOL system. The center operates daily, 24 hours each day. The data center contains two IBM 3090/600E processors, with a combined total of 25 production regions for CICS, testing, or development. Development and production workloads share the processor resources during the first shift, while second and third shifts are dedicated to batch and backup activities.

Each central processing unit (CPU) supports four CICS PARIS/PARISOL regions. Each of the eight CICS regions supports a specific geographic section of the State. This division limits transaction volumes so the system can provide acceptable performance at the user workstation. All eight regions use a common, shared database; therefore, all information is stored in a single file.

Eight node sites, which are located throughout the State, use mid-sized CPUs (five 43XXs and three 9370s) to maintain regionalized client records on decentralized databases. Case files used for on-line processing are established at the nodes, and update transactions are stored there until data are sent to the central mainframe in batch mode.

Peripherals employed to support the two IBM 3090/600E processors are detailed in Exhibit A-6.1. The direct access storage devices (DASD) and tape devices are fully shared between the two processors, which enables the multi-region approach employed in Georgia to be successful. The two distributed printer installations are connected to the central computer complex via two separate channel extension configurations. The first uses Paradyne Pix II extenders via 19.2 KB circuits, and the second uses McData channel extenders via T1 facilities to drive six high speed laser printers.

An uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is installed in the State. It provides 15-minute battery backup and full power capability with a diesel generator. The battery backup system is tested weekly.

Currently, the State does not have an approved or budgeted disaster recovery plan. State staff anticipates that funds for a commercial backup site arrangement will be approved in the FY 1995 budget. At this time, however, the only option available would be to contact a commercial site after a disaster has occurred and attempt to locate, restore, and bring up the production systems in that site. A test plan for disaster recovery has not been created.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

DOAS provides support staff for PARIS/PARISOL and all other Georgia applications. DOAS has the following number and types of support staff: 111 computer operations personnel; nine help desk staff; two production control staff; eight engineering staff responsible for terminal and PC installation support; 29 technical support staff to perform systems programming, database management, DASD management, and network control

functions; and 45 application support personnel. Ten of the 45 applications support personnel are contractors.

Both the DFCS and DOAS management staff believe that current staffing levels are too low as a result of a reduction in force (RIF) that occurred in 1991. State staff also indicated that it is difficult for the State to offer salaries that are competitive with private sector salaries in the Atlanta area. Contractors are being used to support application development, but the number of contractor staff have been reduced recently to conserve funding for the new FAMIS system.

Scheduled full system outages for hardware and software maintenance are normally performed on Sundays. Full DASD backups of all files are conducted each weekend and backups are rotated to the off-site storage area. Incremental backups of application data are performed every night. Tapes are taken off-site daily.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

In February 1993, Georgia implemented a statewide backbone network that supports all State agencies. The network consists of eight node sites (one each in Rome, Columbus, Augusta, Millageville, Savannah and remaining nodes in the metropolitan Atlanta area) that house IBM 3745 front end processors (FEP). The nodes connect to each of their regional county offices through 56 KB multi-dropped circuits. There are 120 of these circuits installed throughout the State. All of the nodes except two are connected directly to the DOAS data center via T1 circuits. Two of the Atlanta area nodes use multiple 56 KB circuits to tie into the data center because of lower transaction volumes. The network uses a SNA/SDLC protocol.

Each node site uses a token ring and bridge structure to connect the local FEP to one of the four data center IBM 3745s. These routers enable the two FEPs to operate as one logical unit and enhance the throughput of the data circuit. Plans have been made to implement additional routers to support TCP/IP for future applications.

The State currently does not have any specific backup plans in place for the telecommunications network. Since the new backbone network is routed through the telephone company central office in Atlanta, rerouting of the circuits to a backup facility would be relatively easy to accomplish.

6.2.4 System Performance

The 3090/600Es are running at 75 percent to 85 percent utilization with current workloads. Based on the scheduled implementation of a new Child Support Enforcement system in early 1994 and plans to implement a new FAMIS system in 1995 or 1996, the State anticipates that a processor upgrade will be required within the next year.

Overall PARIS processing volume is approximately 105,000 transactions per day. The State does not measure transaction volume specifically related to FSP transactions.

6.2.5 System Response

The State does not maintain data related to terminal response time, the time needed to get a response from the system after the "enter" key is hit. Both DOAS and Department of Family and Children Services staff indicated that response times currently average between two and three seconds. The implementation of the new statewide backbone network resulted in significant improvements in response times, which previously had averaged about five seconds.

6.2.6 System Downtime

During FY 1993, the IBM systems supporting PARIS/PARISOL were available 99.8 percent of the scheduled time. DFCS staff did not express any specific concerns about hardware or software availability.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Plans are in place to make the following hardware and software changes:

- Upgrade the IBM 3090/600Es with IBM compatible processors within the next year
- Implement DB2 for new applications
- Evaluate 3490 tape devices and STK silo technology for future uses
- Eliminate older technology 3380 DASD replace with new 3390 DASD

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the following topics: PARIS development costs and approved Federal funding, on-going PARIS operating costs, and methodologies used to allocate PARIS development and operating costs. This section focuses primarily on the costs incurred during the development and implementation of PARISOL, the most recent enhancement to PARIS. Limited cost information was available for the original PARIS development effort. Cost and cost allocation information related to the proposed FAMIS system, currently scheduled for statewide implementation in 1995, has not been released by the State.

The majority of the information in this section was extracted from the following sources:

- State Automation Study, Food Stamp Program, Cost Accounting Interview Guide and Survey completed by Georgia personnel
- Correspondence between FNS and Georgia

- Advanced Planning Document, Amendment 3, January 1985, and all amendments and revisions that followed

- Georgia DHR Cost Allocation Plan, July 1992

7.1 PARIS/PARISOL Development Costs and Federal Funding

Since PARIS was implemented, there have been two major enhancement efforts. Additional capabilities were added to support access to a comprehensive clearinghouse of financial information from other State agencies; these changes were referred to as *Clearinghouse* enhancements. Modifications also were made to provide PARIS with on-line capabilities, including interactive interviewing, as part of the *PARISOL* project. From the documentation reviewed and information provided by Georgia personnel, the total cost of the PARIS/PARISOL development efforts was approximately $14.97 million. The reported costs for the original PARIS system and its two enhancements were:

- PARIS, $9.4 million[4]
- Clearinghouse, $3 million
- PARISOL, $2.57 million (actual reported cost)

The FNS share of the total PARIS/PARISOL cost could not be determined because the State maintains limited documentation related to the PARIS development effort.

The APD for PARIS development was prepared in 1975. Since then, there have been five amendments and revisions to those amendments. This section traces the APD and all amendments submitted for PARIS and its two major enhancements and provides budgeted funding amounts. Actual costs and FNS funding amounts are presented where available.

PARIS. PARIS development and implementation costs were reported to be approximately $8.76 million. This total was comprised of over $3.1 million in costs incurred by the PARIS development and implementation contractor, Consultec, Inc., from 1976 through 1982. An additional $5.66 million was incurred for operating costs during that period. The costs of State personnel and hardware were not included in the development cost amount. FNS funded PARIS at a 50 percent Federal financial participation (FFP) rate.

In January 1985, APD Amendment 3 requested approval of an additional $644,407 to upgrade the PARIS software and provide manuals. The FSP share was $349,838, and the FNS FFP, at a 50 percent rate, was $174,919. FNS approved this share in July 1985.

Clearinghouse Access Capabilities. A July 1985 APD revision requested funding to program and operate a clearinghouse system within PARIS that would allow eligibility workers and supervisors on-line access to wage and unemployment compensation data

[4] PARIS, $8.76 million plus APD Amendment 3, $.644 million.

from the Georgia Department of Labor and other sources including the State Data Exchange. Access to on-line data was available by July 1987.

Clearinghouse funding requests and approvals were as follows:

- The July 1985 APD funding request was for $2,804,459 and included funding for programming and operating the initial clearinghouse system and purchasing and installing 504 microprocessors for statewide installation in county offices at a cost of $1,640,329.

- In February 1987, APD Amendment 4 requested funding for the purchase and installation of microprocessing equipment and related items. The funding request was for 504 workstations at a cost of $2,452,646.

- In June 1987, APD Amendment 4 was revised to address the State legislature's request to phase in the equipment installation. The number of workstations to be purchased remained at 504.

- A February 1988 revision to Amendment 4 requested approval to purchase and install microprocessors and related items. The cost was $2,575,329; the number of workstations to be purchased was 504.

The final cost of clearinghouse implementation was $3.0 million; the FSP share of this amount is unknown. FNS provided $558,186 in funding for this effort. The final cost included $1.6 million for 532 terminals, approximately $314,000 for Department of Labor personnel costs, and $141,000 for programming support. The remaining costs were split among furniture, travel, and printing.

PARISOL. In April 1988, Georgia issued Amendment 5 to the 1975 PARIS APD to request funding for a three phase development effort to enhance existing capabilities of PARIS. Phase I, intake, which was implemented in 1990, provided an on-line interactive update capability to PARIS. Neither Phase II, recertification/redetermination, nor Phase III, historical change, was implemented.

An overview of PARISOL funding requests and approvals follows:

- A revision to Amendment 5 was submitted for approval in July 1988. The budget was $9,591,571; the FSP share was $4,721,872, at the FNS FFP rate of 50 percent, or $2,360,936. The budget included funding for 1,315 intelligent workstations.

- In January 1989, FNS granted interim APD approval to begin development of Phase I, intake, to add an on-line interactive data collection capability to the existing PARIS. The enhancement became known as PARIS On-Line, or PARISOL. The amount approved was $465,189; the FSP share was $208,733, to

be funded at a FFP rate of 50 percent, or $104,367. This approval was exclusive of any equipment purchases.[5]

- In March 1989, FNS approved the APD for $2,732,592.[6] The FSP share was $1,164,270 and was funded at a FFP rate of 50 percent, or $582,135. This approval funded pilot equipment requirements for 40 terminals.

- In August 1989, Georgia submitted to FNS additional information to support the State's request for intelligent workstations. In November 1989, FNS acknowledged receipt of the letter but did not approve the request, citing instead that it did "...not consider it cost beneficial to spend an additional $2.6 million for (intelligent workstation) procurement."[7] FNS acknowledged that it would accept a mix that included 20 percent intelligent workstations and 80 percent dumb terminals.

- In December 1989, Georgia responded with a request for 1,275 terminals; 924 would be dumb terminals, and the remaining 351 would be intelligent workstations.[8] In February 1990, FNS approved $4,314,700 for PARISOL, an FSP share of $2,157,350, with a FFP rate of 50 percent, or $1,078,675.

- In April 1991, Georgia requested approval to procure 86 intelligent workstations.[9] In May 1991, FNS granted approval for $325,285 to cover the costs of these workstations. The FSP share was 42.6 percent, or $138,571 and was funded at a 50 percent FFP, or $69,286.[10]

- In August 1991, FNS approved $192,814 to fund a Planning APD for Phase II of PARISOL. The FSP share at 45 percent was $86,766; the FFP at a 50 percent rate was $43,383.

- In December 1991, Georgia requested approval to purchase 838 non-intelligent terminals. The total amount and FSP share amount were not available. In February 1992, FNS approved the purchase and an FFP of $601,637.

- In August 1992, the State issued an Emergency APD Update (APDU) requesting 973 multi-functional terminals, printers, and communications equipment. The total

[5] Letter, 1/31/89.

[6] Letter, 3/27/89. This amount included the previous $465,189 interim approval.

[7] Letter, 11/7/89.

[8] Letter, 2/20/90, citing 12/20/89 letter from Georgia.

[9] Letter, 4/5/91.

[10] Letter, 5/10/91.

cost was $4,397,155; the FSP share was $1,999,684 with a 50 percent FFP of $999,842. FNS approved the procurement in December 1992.

The development costs of PARISOL were reported to be $2,571,602. The FSP share was $1,146,094, or approximately 45 percent, and the FNS FFP, at a 50 percent rate, was $573,047.[11]

7.1.1 PARIS/PARISOL System Components

PARIS/PARISOL supports the AFDC, Medicaid (Title XIX) and Food Stamp Programs.

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

Individual costs for the major cost components are available for only part of the development effort. These costs are addressed below.

7.1.2.1 Hardware

The history of hardware acquisition to support PARIS/PARISOL is detailed in Section 7.1. Hardware purchases can be summarized as follows:

- There was no specific breakout of hardware purchases for the original PARIS system implemented in March 1984.
- For the clearinghouse effort, 532 terminals were acquired at a cost of $1.6 million.
- Terminals were purchased during and after PARISOL implementation. A five-year depreciation schedule was established for these terminals. As of December 1992, a total of $699,312 in terminal depreciation costs have been incurred for PARISOL. The FNS share of this amount was $157,839. A total of 477 terminals were purchased in batches of 40, 351, and 86.
- An additional 838 terminals were purchased following PARISOL Phase I implementation at an approved cost of over $600,000. Unused PARISOL development money funded this acquisition. Although the depreciation schedule has not yet been established, the quarterly depreciation charge will be $69,141.
- An additional 937 terminals are currently being installed; however, this acquisition is not being funded by FNS at all.

[11] Survey, p. 6.

7.1.2.2 Contractor Costs

Consultec was paid $3,170,269 for PARIS development and implementation support. The details of that contract were not available. Contractor support was not used during Clearinghouse or PARISOL development.

7.1.2.3 State Personnel Costs

State personnel costs were not broken out for PARIS development. State personnel costs for the clearinghouse development effort totalled $455,000. Of this total, Department of Labor personnel costs were $314,000 and programming support was $141,000. For PARISOL, programming costs through FY 1992 were $1.41 million.

7.2 Operational Costs

Table 7.1, PARIS/PARISOL Operating Costs, presents operating costs allocated to FNS for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1990 through the third quarter of FFY 1993 as well as State FY 1991 through State FY 1993. Total PARIS/PARISOL operating costs and the share of those costs allocated to FNS are provided by State Fiscal Year. The percentage of PARIS/PARISOL operating costs allocated to FNS has remained constant at approximately 45 percent during the period.

Table 7.1 PARIS/PARISOL Operating Costs

	Federal FY	State FY		
Year	**SF-269 ADP Operating Costs**	**PARIS/ PARISOL Operating Costs**	**PARIS/ PARISOL Operating Costs - FSP Share $**	**PARIS/ PARISOL Operating Costs - FSP Share %**
1990	$7,841,189	N/A	N/A	N/A
1991	$7,021,113	$13,735,123	$6,209,882	45.21%
1992	$6,852,140	$14,544,136	$6,589,088	45.30%
1993	$4,923,971[12]	$13,963,488	$6,353,290	45.50%

[12] Three quarters.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Average monthly operational costs for the FSP in State FY 1992 was $549,091. Based on the 1992 average monthly Food Stamp Program caseload of 276,524 households, the monthly cost per case was $1.99.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The State data center bills the Department of Human Resources for all operating costs associated with PARIS/PARISOL operations on a monthly basis. The DHR then allocates the majority of these costs to the funding programs using random moment sampling (RMS). The only direct charges are those accumulated for Requests for Data Processing Support, which is described in Section 7.3.2.

7.3 Georgia Cost Allocation Methodologies

The following sections describe the methods used to allocate PARIS, Clearinghouse, and PARISOL development costs as well as PARIS/PARISOL operational costs to each program area.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

The Cost Allocation Plan for PARIS development was not available. The cost allocation percentages approved for PARISOL, however, were based on RMS findings for the quarter ending December 1984. The percentages allocated to the three program areas were:

- Food Stamp Program, 51.78 percent
- AFDC, 38.35 percent
- Medicaid, 9.87 percent

For modules that support only the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs, the following two-program allocation percentages were used:

- Food Stamp Program, 57.5 percent
- AFDC, 42.5 percent

RMS was used to allocate development costs throughout the development period.

7.3.2 PARIS/PARISOL Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

All costs are collected into the Financial Accounting Control (FAC) system. Each individual charge is identified by an Organization Code or a Request for Data Processing Support (RFDPS) which identifies the cost pool into which the charge will be collected.

Cost pools are associated with program areas and the percentage allocation assigned to that program area. The percentage allocations are derived from one of two RMS studies:

- County RMS is conducted in the county offices and is used to allocate county office personnel and operations costs.

- State Office RMS is conducted in the central office and is used to allocate costs incurred by personnel at the State administrative level.

All changes to PARIS/PARISOL modules are authorized with RFDPS. The RFDPS identifies all labor hours associated with that module change. The personnel costs associated with changes are direct charged to the specific program area supported by the module that is changed. If the module supports two programs, the costs are split evenly between the programs. If the module supports more than two programs, the costs are allocated using RMS. Personnel costs for applying a module change are the only direct charges to PARIS/PARISOL.

7.3.2.1 Direct Charge Pools

Table 7.2, Direct Charge Pools, lists the cost pools that are 100 percent allocated to the Food Stamp Program and the types of charges accumulated into these pools.

Table 7.2. Direct Charge Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS
Systems and Methods Contracts	Costs associated with contracts for daily emergency call-in services for direct mail issuance of food stamp coupons.
ATP Cards Mailing	Costs of postage for mailing ATP cards.
Computer Charges	Computer charges applicable to the Food Stamp Program.
Monthly Reporting	Charges associated with the Federal mandate to validate the status of selected Food Stamp recipients monthly.
PARIS Mandated Changes - Food Stamp	Costs of PARIS modifications implemented in support of USDA-mandated regulation charges.
PARIS On-Line Direct USDA	Computer charges for PARISOL development costs associated with the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.2.2 Allocation Cost Pools

Exhibit A-7.1, Allocated Cost Pools, lists the cost pools which are allocated to the Food Stamp Program. The type of charges accumulated into each pool and the method used to allocate each pool also are provided.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF GEORGIA

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to DHHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	10/1/92*	Y	Y	N
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	Y	N	N
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	N
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	N
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	N

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	Y	N	N
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	N
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	Y	N
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of	10/1/89	Y	Y	N

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Georgia Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090/600E	IBM	Purchase	80 channels, 256 MB main storage, 512 MB expanded storage, 88 MIPS
3090/600E	IBM	Purchase	32 channels, 128 MB main storage, 64 expanded storage, 43 MIPS
DISK			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	Controllers - 16 Drives - 3380 (38), 3390 (160)
8380	STK	Purchase	Controllers - 7 Drives - 8380 (52)
9390	Hitachi	Purchase	Controllers - 8 Drives - 9390 (64)
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives Cartridge Drives	STK IBM Hitachi	Purchase Purchase Purchase	4500 (10) 3480 (36) 7480 (12)
PRINTERS			
Impact	STK	Purchase	3800 (1)
Laser	STK	Purchase	6100 (1)
Laser	STK	Purchase	5000 (1)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	9790 (1)
FRONT ENDS			
FEP	IBM	Purchase	3745 (4)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	IBM	Purchase	3270 Terminals (1,811) PS/2s (1,009)

Exhibit A-7.1 Allocated Cost Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS	ALLOCATIONMETHODOLOGY
Public Assistance Section	Salaries and benefits of personnel in this section. The section provides for the management of program planning, policy formulation, and corrective action for division assistance programs. It meets developmental needs of regional and local staff, by providing program consultation, technical assistance, staff development and training needed by Food Stamp Program staff.	DFCS RMS
Management Information Systems	Salaries and benefits of personnel and related costs for developing and managing information systems related to divisional programs as well as all statistical reporting and sampling.	DFCS RMS
Computer Supplies	Salaries and benefits of personnel who manage computer expenditures for divisional programs.	DFCS RMS
Administrative Support Section	Salaries and benefits of section personnel who support budget development and maintenance, expenditure control, Federal reporting, contracting, and general support.	DFCS RMS
DFCS Administrative Support	Salaries and benefits of personnel and related costs to organizations which provide for division-wide expenditures for duplication and divisional programs such as rapid copy cost.	DFCS RMS
PARIS	PARIS operations maintenance charges and mandated changes affecting all programs.	Modified eligibility RMS
PARIS (67-6-15-11)	PARIS changes that impact AFDC and Food Stamp Programs equally.	Direct charge allocated 50:50 to AFDC/State and FSP/State.
PARIS Inserter Machine	Cost of inserter machine based on straight-line depreciation over the useful life of the machine.	County modified eligibility RMS
PARIS On-Line Programs (Intermediate)	Computer charges for PARIS on-line development costs for Food Stamp Program, Title IV-A, and Medicaid.	County modified eligibility RMS as approved by the Federal ratified cost allocation procedures agreement-intermediate cost pool
PARIS On-Line IV-A Intermediate	Computer charges for PARIS on-line development costs for Title IV-A and Food Stamp Program.	Direct charge based on approved Federal ratified cost procedures agreement-intermediate cost pool
PARIS On-Line All Programs/Common	Computer charges for PARIS on-line development costs for Title IV-A, Food Stamp Program, and Title XIX.	Direct charge based on approved Federal ratified cost allocation procedures agreement-common pool
PARIS On-Line Programs/Common Enhanced Funding	Computer charges for PARIS on-line development costs for IV-A approved at the enhanced rate of 90/10, Food Stamp Program at 50/50, and MAO/Title XIX at 50/50.	Direct charge based on approved Federal ratified cost allocation procedures agreement-common pool

Exhibit A-7.1 Allocated Cost Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS	ALLOCATIONMETHODOLOGY
PARIS On-Line Statewide Equipment	Cost of equipment purchased for Phase I PARIS On-Line.	Modified eligibility sample (PARIS)
PARIS Pilot Equipment	Cost of equipment purchased for Phase I pilot.	Predetermined percentage ratified cost agreement
Regional Program Operations	Costs associated with providing administration and programmatic supervision to County Department of Family and Children Services offices to ensure that division objectives are met.	DFCS RMS

APPENDIX B

STATE OF GEORGIA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility workers in Georgia. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Georgia. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Georgia	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
1,823	63	3.5%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	62	98.4%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Georgia. The response rate of 98 percent is very good, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of eligibility workers in Georgia.

Summary of Findings

Most of the eligibility workers are satisfied with the computer system in Georgia. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and easy to learn. Two complaints are that response time is sometimes too slow and that the system is down too often. Most respondents also think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, although 49 percent feel the system adds stress to their jobs.

Since Georgia's current system has been operational since 1984, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	4.8
Good	49	79.0
Excellent	10	16.1

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	15	24.2
Good	42	67.7
Excellent	5	8.1

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	16.7
Sometimes	47	78.3
Often	3	5.0

The eligibility workers who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is usually good or excellent but a majority (83 percent) agree that response time is sometimes or often slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	4	6.7
Often	56	93.3

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	18.3
Sometimes	45	75.0
Often	4	6.7

A large majority (93 percent) of the eligibility workers who responded think the system is generally available although a smaller majority (82 percent) agrees that it is sometimes or often down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	9	14.5
Good	45	72.6
Excellent	8	12.9

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	50	83.3
Sometimes	9	15.0
Often	1	1.7

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	50	83.3
Sometimes	9	15.0
Often	1	1.7

How often is the systems data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	36	61.0
Sometimes	17	28.8
Often	6	10.2

The eligibility workers who responded consistently feel that the operations of the system are accurate. A large majority (85 percent) of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	56.5
Sometimes	24	38.7
Often	3	4.8

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	48	78.7
Sometimes	12	19.7
Often	1	1.6

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	69.4
Sometimes	8	16.3
Often	7	14.3

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	43	78.2
Sometimes	6	10.9
Often	6	10.9

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	49	86.0
Sometimes	4	7.0
Often	4	7.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	43	82.7
Sometimes	5	9.6
Often	4	7.7

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	44	74.6
Sometimes	12	20.3
Often	3	5.1

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	44	77.2
Sometimes	11	19.3
Often	2	3.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	46	78.0
Sometimes	10	16.9
Often	3	5.1

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	71.4
Sometimes	15	26.8
Often	1	1.8

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	46	83.6
Sometimes	6	10.9
Often	3	5.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	41	78.8
Sometimes	8	15.4
Often	3	5.8

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	60.0
Sometimes	3	10.0
Often	9	30.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	68.1
Sometimes	10	21.3
Often	5	10.6

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	45	77.6
Sometimes	9	15.5
Often	4	6.9

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	43	81.1
Sometimes	5	9.4
Often	5	9.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	48	82.8
Sometimes	5	8.6
Often	5	8.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	20	47.6
Sometimes	9	21.4
Often	13	31.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	59.6
Sometimes	10	19.2
Often	11	21.2

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	41	73.2
Sometimes	11	19.6
Often	4	7.1

Most of the eligibility workers responding do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks such as assigning new case numbers or generating adverse action notices. One exception is identifying error prone cases; over 50 percent of the eligibility workers experience some difficulty with this task.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	3.3
Sometimes	4	6.7
Often	54	90.0

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	50.8
Sometimes	21	35.6
Often	8	13.6

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	44	74.6
Sometimes	10	16.9
Often	5	8.5

Most of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work although about half report that it adds stress to their jobs.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	43	78.2
Sometimes	11	20.0
Often	1	1.8

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	74.1
Sometimes	9	16.7
Often	5	9.3

Most of the eligibility workers who responded agree that expedited service is rarely difficult to provide.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Georgia's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Georgia's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX C

STATE OF GEORGIA

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of supervisors in Georgia. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Georgia. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Georgia	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
344	30	8.7
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	25	83.3%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Georgia. The response rate of 83 percent is good, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of supervisors in Georgia.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs, although 66 percent feel that it adds stress to their work. Most of the respondents found the system easy to use but about half have some problems learning to use it. The supervisors also report rarely having difficulty performing their specific system-related tasks.

Since Georgia's current system has been operational since 1984, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.0
Good	22	88.0
Excellent	2	8.0

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	32.0
Good	17	68.0

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	8.0
Sometimes	22	88.0
Often	1	4.0

The supervisors who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although an equal number also feel that the system response time is sometimes too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	1	4.0
Often	24	96.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	8.3
Sometimes	22	91.7

Almost all the supervisors who responded think the system is generally available but again an almost equal number feel that the system is down sometimes.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	8.0
Good	22	88.0
Excellent	1	4.0

The supervisors who responded generally find the information and algorithms of the system to be accurate. Most of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	64.0
Sometimes	9	36.0

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	48.0
Sometimes	13	52.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	60.0
Sometimes	5	25.0
Often	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	71.4
Sometimes	5	23.8
Often	1	4.8

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	90.9
Sometimes	2	9.1

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	82.6
Sometimes	3	13.0
Often	1	4.3

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	18	72.0
Sometimes	3	12.0
Often	4	16.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	83.3
Sometimes	4	16.7

Most of the supervisors responding have no difficulty obtaining information but over half have difficulty in learning the system. Those who responded generally do not have difficulty performing such specific tasks as generating adverse action notices or restoring benefits.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	4.0
Sometimes	4	16.0
Often	20	80.0

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	33.3
Sometimes	14	58.3
Often	2	8.3

Most of the supervisors who responded (80 percent) think that the current system is a great help to them in their work but a majority (66 percent) feel that it contributes added stress.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	12.0
Good	22	88.0

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	34.8
Good	15	65.2

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	68.8
Sometimes	4	25.0
Often	1	6.3

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	63.2
Sometimes	6	31.6
Often	1	5.3

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, although 37 percent report difficulty in meeting Federal reporting requirements. Most think the reports produced by the system are good but a significant minority, 35 percent, think the quality of the support provided by the technical staff is poor.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Georgia's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Georgia's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.